

Commissioner for Patents  
Application Serial No. 10/722,961  
September 27, 2006  
Page 10

SEP 27 2006

## REMARKS

I. Summary of the Examiner's ActionA. Objection to Specification Amendments

At page 4, lines 11 – 16 of the April 19 Office Action, the Examiner objected to amendments made to the specification in Applicant's March 19, 2006 Amendment under 35 U.S.C. § 132(a) because they allegedly introduced new matter into the disclosure.

B. Claim Rejections

Claims 15, 17, 25 and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement.

Claims 1, 2 and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by United States Patent No. 6,625,750 to Duso *et al.* (hereinafter "the Duso patent").

Claims 1 and 5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by United States Patent Application Publication No. US 2001/0001563 A1 to Tomaszewski (hereinafter "the Tomaszewski application").

Claim 3 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over the Tomaszewski application in view of United States Patent No. 6,622,178 to Burke *et al.* (hereinafter "the Burke patent").

Commissioner for Patents  
Application Serial No. 10/722,961  
September 27, 2006  
Page 11

Claim 4 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tomaszewski in view of Burke and further in view of "On-The-Go Supplement to the USB 2.0 Specification Revision 1.0a" of Chandler *et al.* (hereinafter "the Chandler USB 2.0 reference").

Claims 6, 7, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16, 24 and 25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Burke patent in view of the Chandler USB 2.0 reference.

Claims 17, 18, 19, 23 and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Tomaszewski patent in view of the Chandler USB 2.0 reference.

These objections and rejections are respectfully disagreed with, and traversed below.

C. Allowable Subject Matter

The Examiner objected to claims 8 – 10 and 12 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but indicated that the claims would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claim.

Commissioner for Patents  
Application Serial No. 10/722,961  
September 27, 2006  
Page 12

II. Summary of Interviews Conducted on September 27, 2006

In telephonic interviews conducted on September 27, 2006, the Examiner indicated that the Second Amendment in Response to Final Rejection dated September 19, 2006 placed the application in condition for allowance except for claim 22. The Examiner indicated that a misimpression had developed in prior discussions regarding what claims were allowable in the case and that claim 22 as reflected in the Second Amendment in Response to Final Rejection dated September 19, 2006 was not allowable in its current form. The Interview Summary which clarified the situation was not mailed until September 20, 2006, and thus was not available to Applicant's Representative in preparing the Second Amendment in Response to Final Rejection submitted on September 19, 2006.

In a later teleconference with the Supervisory Patent Examiner responsible for the application, it was agreed that amending claim 22 in similar manner to claim 1 would result in the allowance of claim 22. The Supervisory Patent Examiner also indicated that both the Second Amendment in Response to Final Rejection and this Supplemental Amendment to the Second Amendment in Response to Final Rejection would be entered, placing this application in condition for allowance.

Applicant's Representative thanks the Examiner and the Supervisory Patent Examiner for agreeing to enter these amendments.

Commissioner for Patents  
Application Serial No. 10/722,961  
September 27, 2006  
Page 13

III. Applicant's Response

In telephonic interviews conducted on September 27, 2006 it was indicated that amendments and remarks contained in the Second Amendment in Response to Final Rejection dated September 19, 2006 placed the case in condition for allowance except for claim 22. Applicant has amended claim 22 in a similar manner to claim 1. Applicant respectfully submits that claim 22 is now allowable for reasons similar to those set forth with respect to claim 1 in the Second Amendment in Response to Final Rejection dated September 19, 2006.

Commissioner for Patents  
Application Serial No. 10/722,961  
September 27, 2006  
Page 14

IV. Conclusion

Applicant submits that in light of the foregoing remarks, amendments and the September 8 and 27 Interviews, the application is now in condition for allowance. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the outstanding rejections be withdrawn and that the case be passed to issuance.

Respectfully submitted,

September 27, 2006

Date

David M. O'Neill (35,304)

David M. O'Neill (35,304)

Customer No.: 29683

HARRINGTON & SMITH, LLP  
4 Research Drive  
Shelton, CT 06484-6212  
Telephone: (203) 925-9400  
Facsimile: (203) 944-0245  
Email: [DOneill@hspatent.com](mailto:DOneill@hspatent.com)

---

**CERTIFICATION OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on the date shown below.

September 27, 2006

Date

David M. O'Neill

Name of Person Making Deposit